

**From:** [McKenna, James \(Jim\)](#)  
**To:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Food Web Model for Portland Harbor  
**Date:** 05/30/2006 03:14 PM

---

Eric, neither time works for me, but please move forward with the meeting tomorrow with our tech folks (and hopefully Rick and/or Bob). Jim.

-----Original Message-----

From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov <Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov>  
To: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov <Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov>  
CC: Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov <Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov>;  
Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov <Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov>; hope.bruce@deq.state.or.us  
<hope.bruce@deq.state.or.us>; jean.lee@eiltld.net <jean.lee@eiltld.net>; McKenna, James (Jim);  
kpine@integral-corp.com <kpine@integral-corp.com>; Lisa Saban <lisas@windwardenv.com>;  
nancyj@windwardenv.com <nancyj@windwardenv.com>; ricka@bes.ci.portland.or.us  
<ricka@bes.ci.portland.or.us>; rjw@nwnatural.com <rjw@nwnatural.com>; Ron.Gouguet@noaa.gov  
<Ron.Gouguet@noaa.gov>; rpastorok@integral-corp.com <rpastorok@integral-corp.com>;  
chris.thompson@eiltld.net <chris.thompson@eiltld.net>  
Sent: Tue May 30 13:33:47 2006  
Subject: Re: Food Web Model for Portland Harbor

I would like to schedule a conference call to discuss the food web model for Portland Harbor tomorrow at 10:00 am or 3:00 pm. Please let me know if you can participate at either of these times. I will pick the time when the most people can participate.

Thanks, Eric

Eric Blischke/R10/USE PA/US	To
05/25/2006 02:50 PM	Bruce Hope, Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US, Lisa Saban <lisas@windwardenv.com>, Jean Lee, Nancy Judd, Rob Pastorok, Ron Gouguet
	cc
	rjw@nwnatural.com, ricka@bes.ci.portland.or.us, Jim.McKenna@portofportland.com, Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, kpine@integral-corp.com
	Subject
	Food Web Model for Portland Harbor

At Tuesday's management meeting, we discussed the path forward on the Food Web Modeling effort for the Portland Harbor site. The food web

model is considered critical for the development of initial PRGs in the Round 2 Comprehensive Site Summary and Data Gaps Report. EPA submitted comments on the latest draft of the Food Web Model Report on March 3, 2006. Although the LWG submitted a response to EPA comments on April 21, 2006, EPA and the LWG have not yet met to discuss how to resolve the comments.

As everyone should be aware, we are scheduled to discuss modeling efforts (including the food web model) at our June 6, 2006 joint technical and management meeting. We would like to be able to develop a path forward for the next iteration of the food web model using all available Round 2 data. Outstanding issues identified by the LWG include:

- Chemicals to modeled: LWG has proposed PCBs (total and congeners), dioxins/furans, and DDTs because these chemicals have been detected commonly in LWR tissue and sediment samples and the Arnot and Gobas model is recommended for hydrophobic organics. EPA and its partners have proposed a longer list including individual PAHs and metals.
- Spatial scale: LWG proposes application of the model for the purposes of the RBCT development on a site wide scale (e.g. RM 2-11) using surface weighted average sediment chemical concentrations. This facilitates maximum use of available data. EPA and its partners have proposed application of the FWM at smaller spatial scales (i.e. 34 segments) for FS applications such as evaluating remedial alternatives.
- Model compartments: LWG needs clarification on the preferences of EPA and its partners for model compartments (e.g. species to be modeled and how they are grouped) and the implications of this for treatment of input data (e.g. percent lipids) and comparisons to empirical tissue chemistry data for model performance evaluation. (This may have implications for Round 3 data collections needs). Just need final agreement.
- Model performance goals and approaches to calibration: LWG would like to come to agreement with EPA and its partners on specific performance goals for the model to be used for development of RBCTs (and ultimately PRGs). LWG proposes primary calibration of the model to be based on total PCBs. While performance may vary across chemicals, LWG would like to come to agreement with EPA and its partners on minimum model performance criteria for the application of the FWM for use in developing RBCTs.
- Programming: EPA and its partners commented that they would prefer the model be rewritten in VBA. Is the version provided by Jon Arnot (entirely in Excel) acceptable for application for the Round 2 Report?

I would like to set up a conference call next week to discuss how to proceed. At this time, Bruce Hope has limited availability on Wednesday and Thursday and is unavailable on Tuesday and Friday. Burt Shephard is available primarily on Tuesday and Friday - thus we have a conflict. I recognize that everyone may not be able to participate in next week's call. However if you send me your availability I will maximize the number of people that can attend.

Thanks, Eric

